

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF AMENDED BILL

Author: Liu Analyst: Deborah Barrett Bill Number: AB 2098
 Related Bills: See Prior Analysis Telephone: 845-4301 Amended Date: April 5, 2006
 Attorney: Patrick Kusiak Sponsor: _____

SUBJECT: State Government Electronic Payment System

DEPARTMENT AMENDMENTS ACCEPTED. Amendments reflect suggestions of previous analysis of bill as introduced/amended _____.

AMENDMENTS IMPACT REVENUE. A new revenue estimate is provided.

X AMENDMENTS DID NOT RESOLVE THE DEPARTMENTS CONCERNS stated in the previous analysis of bill as introduced February 17, 2006.

FURTHER AMENDMENTS NECESSARY.

DEPARTMENT POSITION CHANGED TO _____.

X REMAINDER OF PREVIOUS ANALYSIS OF BILL AS INTRODUCED February 17, 2006 STILL APPLIES.

OTHER – See comments below.

SUMMARY

This bill would require the Department of Technology Services to design and implement a statewide electronic payment system for use by all state agencies.

SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS

The April 5, 2006, amendments added language that would require the Department of Technology to consult with the State Controller's office to develop an electronic payment system for use by all state agencies. The amendments did not resolve the Implementation Concerns identified in the department's previous analysis of the bill as introduced on February 17, 2006. The "Implementation Concerns" and "Fiscal Impact" are restated below for convenience. The remainder of the department's analysis of the bill as introduced February 17, 2006, still applies.

POSITION

Pending.

Board Position:

_____ S _____ NA _____ NP
 _____ SA _____ O _____ NAR
 _____ N _____ OUA _____ X PENDING

Legislative Director

Date

Brian Putler

4/11/06

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

The department has identified the following implementation concerns. Department staff is available to work with the author's office to resolve these and other concerns that may be identified.

It is unclear whether the electronic payment processing system to be designed by the Department of Technology Services is intended to replace or augment any existing procedures currently in place at FTB. According to the author's staff, use of the system would be optional for state agencies, so if a more efficient process is already in place, that process would not need to be altered. It is recommended that express language to clarify this intent be added to the bill.

FISCAL IMPACT

To the extent that the system developed under this bill does not alter current procedures in place at the FTB, there would be no impact to the department's programs or operations. Until clarification of how the new system is expected to augment or replace current procedures is obtained, the department is unable to identify the potential fiscal impact.

LEGISLATIVE STAFF CONTACT

Deborah Barrett
Franchise Tax Board
(916) 845-4301
deborah.Barrett@ftb.ca.gov

Brian Putler
Franchise Tax Board
(916) 845-6333
brian.putler@ftb.ca.gov